

# THE SHAKER MANIFESTO.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
WHAT IS HOME? . . . . .	73	CORRESPONDENCE:	
THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY READING "THE SHAKER'S ANSWER," . . . . .	74	Nihilism—Socialism—Shakerism—which? . . . .	86
FRUITS OF THE HARVEST, . . . . .	75	Queries to a Boston Materialist, . . . . .	89
SELF-SACRIFICE, . . . . .	76	EDITORIAL:	
ONE MAN—ONE CHRIST—ONE GOD, . . . . .	76	Is Christ's Example a Safe Rule of Life? . . . .	90
GOD IS GOD, . . . . .	78	EDITORIAL NOTES, . . . . .	91
IS A VIRGIN LIFE CONTRARY TO LAW? . . . . .	79	THE CHILDREN'S GROTTO, . . . . .	93
SHE RATTLES THE SHAKERS, . . . . .	82	SOCIETY RECORD, . . . . .	94
OPEN LETTER, . . . . .	82	MUSIC:	
A VERY PLAIN SHAKER LETTER, . . . . .	83	Consecration, . . . . .	95
		BOOK TABLE, . . . . .	96
		KIND WORDS OF US, . . . . .	96

VOL. X.

APRIL, 1880.

No. 4.

### WHAT IS HOME?

ELIZAETTE SUTTON.

Webster defines the word, and yet we are not quite satisfied with it as merely the "house in which we live." One has said: "Home is not only four square walls." Another says: "Home is where there are friends to love us." We can but accept this, because it is the most congenial to instinct, as well as to our cultivated tastes. We cannot say that home is the work of artisans, though the arrangement of the structure may be altogether lovely, grand in form, in color and value, every thing tidy and full of neatness to the eye. We admit that all this lives in imagination, with a wish to be gratified, and which moves to action, and forces its way in home objects. Home is anywhere where there is an interest in the soul for high purposes.

There are classes of people who distinguish themselves apart from society, with no appreciation of outward embellishments, who have homes of intense interest and profit. The recluse in the mountains; the hermit in a solitary cave; the secluded monk. They never tire of devoting themselves (in their way) to restrictions in worldly show and ambition for the radiance of divine light and influence, proving that

that home consists in peace of mind—in living for an object, and that, a virtuous, self-denying one. Moral excellence creates a home, and secures limitless comforts and associations of true happiness; but "excellence" is never granted to us but as the reward of labor. It requires, indeed, much strength of mind to persevere in habits of industry without the pleasure of perceiving those advances, which, like the hand of a clock, whilst they make hourly approaches to their point, yet proceed so slowly as to escape observation. "The groveling narrow mind, with little or no conception of a future state, sustains itself, by low, inferior means; it neither sees nor feels the bliss of home culture in its truest meaning. Broad minds have no rest nor peace in small circles; they must inherit the earth scientifically, as well as the heavens spiritually. They expand with every new and appropriate development, socially, morally, intellectually and spiritually. Progress paves their way to all useful knowledge, and hope arises with every new step taken toward the summit of perfection.

Life fraught with good intentions, noble themes and high aspirations for pure principles, makes *home*, and not the fallacy of art within mortared walls. With our mortal existence, based upon immortal life and its controlling power, our home is made

beautiful — it is all fitting for the nobles of earth, whatever their profession, caste or emoluments have been. Classics are not without their power in building up the New Earth, as well as the New Heavens.

All pervading is the spirit of truth ; it lives in the hearts of men and women, and needs but the genial rays of the gospel sun to quicken it into action, thereby harvesting individuals from nature's realm into the kingdom of Christ.

We need not go to the homes of earth in a worldly life, for a compensation of joys, incident to a heavenly home of unsurpassed merit and worth. Genuine happiness is found in home sacrifices, in patient hearts who toil in love and sympathy for the whole household.

We need not follow the mourner along life's way for a cordial of hope and cheer ; for the resurrecting power is in every Christian heart, preparing it for the enjoyment of a perfect heaven.

My dear friends, this being New Year's day a retrospect of the past year may aid us somewhat, in the fulfillment of obligations in the future. If, with the eye of faith, we see failures in the time that has been allotted us for improvement, let us hold ourselves in greater subjection to principles in this year which we have just entered upon ; remembering that the statue of the perfect man and woman is attained only by slow gradations of travel, study of food and patience. Our experience teaches us that the first victory over a weakness or fault renders the succeeding ones easier, until the combat is really desired for the gain of conquest. We must not place our hopes on impossibilities and think to conserve the elements of the world, and still be in the cause of faith and victory. The limits are sure ; we cannot be in possession of both at one and the same time. We are called into a Christian life, let us pursue it with an honorable spirit and not be baffled in Christian attainments ; divest ourselves of the old and put on a new attire of love and goodwill to all in this new year ; strive to live so that the beautiful will be present at all times and in all places. Home-serving principles go before all others in this en-

lightened age. The more we enter into the duties of home the more our influence is felt for its improvement. If a sweet temper guides our steps, pangs of remorse cannot follow ; if we light up every department of home with a smile, a word of cheer, affectionate encouragement and enduring friendship, how can we fail to acquire noble conditions, in which we can say with the one of old, How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles O Israel.

#### THOUGHTS SUGGESTED BY READING "THE SHAKER'S ANSWER."

I've read your "Shaker's Answer" with great care,

And think your argument is strong and fair ;  
It well maintains the cause which you defend  
And my congratulations here I send !

Your calm and cogent reasoning doth prove  
You well have studied Christ's great law of love,

Which men to practice have been ever slow,  
Preferring in the *world's* "broad road" to go.

How long alas, will mankind go astray,  
And in their blindness miss the better way ?  
Your plan of life based on the word in-  
spired,

Alone can bring the blessed time desired  
By bards and prophets of the olden time,  
Who then foretold it in their strains sub-  
lime ;

The era grand when all shall know the Lord,  
Live by the *spirit* and trust in his word.

When groveling sense, and appetite and  
pride

Will be by all God's children thrown aside,  
When to the higher life all men will turn  
And of the meek and lowly Saviour learn,  
Who teacheth us all fleshy lusts to spurn ;  
The new and better way when will men find,  
Which works no ill to body or to mind ?

The law of progress, potent in its sway,  
Will bring all men Christ's precepts to  
obey ;

And those who *now* the higher law embrace  
Are benefactors of the human race ;  
Blessing themselves and all their neighbors  
too ;

Alas, that here we find so very *few* !  
They are the "little" which the whole will  
leaven,  
And make the earth a foretaste sweet of  
heaven !

Then glory like a shining robe will fall  
Upon the earth and "God be all in all ;"  
Filled with this spirit all the earth shall be,  
As waters spread and fill the mighty sea !

Then every eye shall see come down to men  
The bright and shining New Jerusalem !  
Keep on your way dear "Shaker friends"  
so-called,

By no rude opposition be appalled,  
But "shake" old errors till their sway shall  
cease

And men shall live in harmony and peace !

FRIEND WHITELEY : During the visit of my daughter to Fitchburg last summer, she stopped awhile at your village in company with Mrs. H— and daughter. Upon her return home she expressed much pleasure in regard to her visit to *Shirley*, and brought me your (Shaker's) "Answer" which has prompted the above lines.

"May the Lord bless you and keep you, and cause His face to shine upon you and give you peace." To which *Sarah* heartily responds.

JOSEPH W. NYE.

Lynn, Mass.

### FRUITS OF THE HARVEST.

O. C. HAMPTON.

For many long and weary years, as I stated in my last, I continued to struggle against my lower, rudimental proclivities, observing the serenity and perfect spiritual repose of many who had long preceded me in the Christian warfare : and yearning and longing, with groanings and earnest prayers, to enter into that eternal rest with them, which I was fully convinced they had entered into *here even in this life*. I was well convinced, from constant association with them, they had had no reason to wait the scenes of a future life to realize the "powers of the world to come," with its saving, comforting, healing inspirations ; for a measure of these I was often made to feel for a season, by impartation from them ; sometimes in such effusions of love and power as to drive all insinuations from the side of my lower instincts, far away from me even "into the uttermost parts of Egypt," and leave me as it were, translated to the highest Heaven of peace and tranquillity. The exact process of my experience has been, in regard to this spiritual exodus from rudimental to higher planes, that the seasons of

temptation have gradually *shortened*, and the seasons of releasement and invulnerable triumph *lengthened*, until at last I enjoy the very same state of immunity from temptation and sorrow I looked upon in others with such longings and deep yearnings of spirit in other years—others whom I was sure had entered into deep spiritual rest and at-one-ment with the spirit of God. How it might have fared with me had I been practically unsettled, wavering and vacillating, I cannot say ; it would probably have postponed the good days of final and effectual victory for years ; but from the first day of my religious experience, I am not aware of having yielded to lower impulses of soul or body once. I seem to have entered a serene and delicious region of everlasting consolations which are to be met on every hand—precious fruits of the higher life—pleasure in doing good—enjoyment of sweet purity—love toward brethren and sisters—cheerfulness and gladness in all duties, together with the hundred fold of houses, lands, brethren and sisters ; and above all, the actual fruition and experience of that eternal life and peace which I was formerly only able to *hope* for, or to enjoy the realities of, but for a very little season at a time. Now it is a constant "well of water, springing up unto everlasting life." I often dream of reoccupying those old battle grounds of former years, only to wake up and find the blissful reality of releasement and immunity from them forever. Moreover, having kept a journal of my entire life-history, both of the scenes of sorrow and temptation and the delicious after-deliverances of joy and ensuing peace and restful sense of victory, I often read over those lonely pilgrimages ; those times and places of refreshment, and feel like the mariner who hears the far-off boom of the ocean storm, but is safely and cozily moored, far from its dangers forever. O, that men would prove the words of Jesus Christ and Ann Lee to the end ! How immeasurably transcending all the pleasures to be enjoyed upon the poor, low plane of rudimental existence. If these encouraging words will nerve any Zion traveler, old or young, to the glorious struggle for life eternal, I shall

be many times rewarded for the pains I have taken to write them.

*Union Village, O.*

### SELF-SACRIFICE.

EVELYN STROWBRIDGE.

Among the many essential qualities which constitute the true believer's life, perhaps there is none more important than self-sacrifice. Human nature in its present perverted condition partakes of many evils; but selfishness is the all-prevailing sin; for its pernicious influence unquestionably bears away, much impeding humanity's nobler development.

Mind is the propelling power that prompts our actions; unless this is attuned to its Giver, a God of benefice and love, how can we progress toward the higher courts of justice and purity, or attain that culture of soul that will prepare us for the society of angels?

It seems evident that there must be a subjugation of self-will, a reconciliation to divine command, a dissolving of that selfhood which has so long stood as a detriment between the soul and its maker; and this can be wrought only through self-sacrifice. Jesus taught us how to do. He said: "Except ye deny yourselves and take up your daily cross ye cannot be My disciples." Herein is contained the whole truth whereby we can become reconciled to our divine Parents.

When through Christian faith the effulgent rays of divine light reach and reveal the lone, meager condition of the soul, then there is an inward longing for something higher, nobler than self; a desire for something superior, which neither the world nor its votaries can give. 'Tis then we would turn to the broad field of self-sacrifice for comfort and employ; here we find multifarious duties which pertain to the present life and need our willing hands to perform; and here, too, we find "labor that is worship and prayer," for it requires the undivided energies of the whole heart to properly execute it. The soul, it is said, "does not feed on dust," but being of divine

origin it must forever subsist on the inexhaustible supplies of the spiritual kingdom. Self-sacrifice, when applied to spirit-life, works inwardly. "Behold I set up a new kingdom within you;" it takes on the yoke of Christ, and implies strict obedience to the highest convictions of Christian duty. Thus, daily deeds of self-sacrifice, wrought in humility and prayer, will continue to deepen and broaden the soul in the happyfying realities of divine truth, until there is no room for that which would defile or separate the soul from its divine Creator.

*Enfield, Conn.*

### ONE MAN — ONE CHRIST — ONE GOD.

GILES B. AVERY.

The use sometimes made of words in a language confounds the senses, and misleads the understanding. Much theological controversy and discussion is oftentimes simply the result of a want of knowledge by the reader, or listener, of the meaning the writer or speaker had in mind when using the word or term considered. The scriptures abound with tropes. To illustrate, slightly, we refer to the scriptural use of the words "*All*," "*Judea*," "*region*," in the sentence: "Then went out to Him *all Judea*, and *all the region* round about Jordan." "*All*," meaning simply a large number; "*Judea*" is a country; it could not go to Jesus; the same of "*region*" — an extent of country; *this* could not go to Jesus; but these are figures of speech, meaning the people of *Judea* and the *region*. Again: "Let the floods clap their hands, let the hills be joyful together." "The ploughmen ploughed upon my back, they made long their furrows." Such, and multitudes of others, being tropes. "*Floods*," meaning *multitudes* of people; and "*hills*" *dignitaries* of peoples; "*ploughmen*" meaning *chastisers* or *persecutors*. Thus also the language of Jesus: "Go ye into *all* the world, and preach the gospel to *every creature*;" the term "*all the world*" having reference to a wide region, within the bounds of the apostles' capacity; and "*every creature*," meaning *all classes of people, capable of re-*

ceiving the testimony; not to the lower orders of animal creation.

In speaking of the human race, the *genus homo*, both scriptural and secular language alike use the word *Man* in a bi-sexual sense, meaning both man and woman; also the myriads of the human race. In this sense there is but *one man*—a *race* of beings. This meaning of the word *Man* is also used in expressing perfect gospel unity and love, freed from the divisions engendered by violations of God's laws. Thus, as sung by the poetess:

"In thee\* the veil (of separation) is rent and gone,  
And love is sweetly flowing;  
The male and female are but *one*  
To full perfection growing."

This is synonymous with the scripture language: "In Christ there is neither male nor female;" meaning *generatively*.

Conformable to the foregoing, there is but *one Christ*; *Christ* meaning the *Order of intelligences* constituted by being anointed agent to minister the *light, knowledge*, and *power* of salvation and redemption from the nature of sin to the family of *man*. This *Order* of intelligences, whether *two* or *more*, constitutes the *genus Christos*. But, at the same time, we understand this *Order* to embrace both male and female, and that the female man was as really chosen and anointed, made Christ, to perform the Christ service, as was Jesus, the male; thus adapting the characteristics of the gospel's savory plan to all the intricacies and delicacies of human nature.

In the foregoing summary, also, we speak of *One God*, meaning the Supreme Parentage of Creation—a Divine Father and Mother, constituting the *genus Deus*.—The *God Order*! But there are other forms of expression by which a person might be misled who is unacquainted with this idiom of the English language or with the theology of the revelation of God, as manifested by the Second Appearing of the Christ Order in the female, thus revealing the *Motherhood of God*,—to suppose that this theology taught *numerous Gods*! Thus, as we have the scripture language: "And God said let us make man in our image and likeness,"

\* Man, purified by the fire of truth.

meaning *God*, constituted of the principles or attributes of both sexes. To render this sentiment entirely unambiguous, except in the foregoing signification of the use of the word *Man*, the language should be: "And the *Gods* said, let us," etc. And since "He that hath the Bride is the Bridegroom," in like use of language we should say, "And the *Christs* said, no man cometh to the Father" (and Mother)—God, "but by *us*, instead of *Me*." But at the time Jesus said "*Me*," in the above sentence, the *Bride Christ* had not been revealed. The *Man*—Jesus Christ—revealed the *Fatherhood* of God, and the *Woman*—Ann Christ—revealed the *Motherhood* of God. Thus the Christians of the primitive Church were only "Children of God by adoption." If there was a perfect Christ Order in the spirit world previous to its advent through Jesus and Ann, it was beyond the knowledge of the inhabitants of earth; perhaps beyond the ken of Jesus when He uttered the foregoing sentence, and further said: "I am the way, truth and life; and he that climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth." The word "*sphere*" is also sometimes used so as to mislead for want of qualifying expressions; it is a word of many meanings, but a prominent one is "*An Order of beings*." This use and understanding are sometimes confounded as referring to the *character* of beings. Thus the *angel sphere* is often understood to mean exclusively *good* angels; whereas angels, as an *Order* of beings, are by no means *all good*! There are devilish angels. But in the sense of an *Order of intelligences*, we may appropriately apply the term "*sphere*" to Deity—The Divine sphere. To Christ—The *Christ sphere*, meaning the abode of all spirits of the Christ Order, male and female. Thus, also, may we use the terms, Angel sphere, Human sphere, etc., referring to orders of intelligences.

"But if Jesus was the "*First begotten son of God*," and for a time, "*The only begotten son of God*;" if he was the *Second Adam*, the *Lord from Heaven*, a *quickening spirit*; "*the beginning of the Creation* (New Crea-



tion) of God," of whom it is written: "When He bringeth His *first begotten* into the world. He saith: 'Let all the *Angels of God* worship Him,' was He not the beginning of the Christ sphere? At least, as far as revealed to *mortals*? Both Jesus and Ann had, while on earth, as real a mission to souls in the spirit world as to those in time. Mother Ann was known to spend much time when her soul was exclusively exercised in labors with souls in the spirit world. And if the myriads of souls who entered the spirit world waited thousands of years for the advent of their Redeemer, it was no more for them than for those of the same race on earth. All the human family wait still for the immense progress of future ages, in the same manner. But our Mother Ann's testimony was: "All souls will be privileged with a knowledge of this gospel testimony, either in time or eternity."

*Shakers, N. Y.*

### GOD IS GOD.

F. W. EVANS.

Organized — or unorganized? That is the question to be answered.

One asks, perhaps somewhat contemptuously, "If God be an organized being, can a tailor make God a coat?"

It might be answered — not only have tailors made God a coat, but artificers have previously made the God who was destined to wear it. Does that prove that God is unorganized? Can the human mind conceive of a thinking, knowing, intelligent Deity that is not an organized being?

Canst thou search out the Almighty? Canst thou comprehend the Most High to perfection? Shall not God, who made the human eye, see? made the human ear, hear? the human heart, shall not He and She understand?

Can we see but with the eye? hear but with the ear? or understand but with the brain?

It is by successive stages that the mind of man progresses to a perception of interior spiritual truths. In the first stage we have Fetichism — a rock, a tree, a serpent, is endowed with life, as a ghost-frightened boy

turns a burnt tree into a hobgoblin — it is worshipped.

In the second stage, we have Idolatry. Of the most precious, costly material he possesses, man makes an image of his highest ideal of a human being, whether male or female, and clothes it as his fancy directs — then he falls down and worships the God he has made and clothed.

In the third stage the progressing man constructs a *mental* image of his progressed God — and worships it. Still again, the man endeavors to form a conception of a Spiritual Being — a God who governs the universe of worlds filled with accountable beings like ourselves — as a king or queen governs a nation or nations. Why not? No ruler is personally present throughout all the parts of the realm governed.

The Queen of England's dominion is not only from sea to sea, but from one end of the earth to the other. She rules over congeries of nations without personal ubiquity. Cannot God do the same? All political power is from the Queen. All intellect, knowledge, faculty to perceive, power to be, think and act, is of God.

Is it not glory enough for God to be recognized by all the rulers in the universe of worlds immeasurable, as the central force, or fountain, from whence all their power is derived? Are not all governments founded upon this idea? God is, and God is *dual* — the great Father and Mother of all sentient souls.

If we apprehended Deity entirely aright, in extent and quality, how could we progress to further knowledge — grow in grace and in the knowledge of divine things?

If God be the unorganized *nature* of the Materialist, or Atheist, why should not those who hold sincerely to this view, say so in good, plain English?

Who is an Atheist? "One who disbelieves in the existence of an intelligent Supreme Being." Supreme means "the highest in authority." Intelligent means "to be endowed with the faculty of understanding — to know." Being is an intelligent, immaterial existence, or spirit." Each of these parts of speech, when applied to Deity, implies that above all rulers, there is

one who is the ruler of rulers—above all intelligent beings; is one who is superior to all others. And above all beings, there exists a Being who embodies more knowledge, reasons more logically, understands more perfectly, knows more positively than any, or all other beings that exist in the worlds and spheres of matter, mind and intellect—a supreme, intelligent dual being—God.

Inasmuch as all the intelligence we know any thing about, from man, upwards or downwards, is possessed and exhibited by organized beings, we are incapable of conceiving an existence of intelligences in an unorganized elementary state. Mind, will, purpose, intention, design, plan, rule, love, affection, and an organized being, are inseparable concomitants, equally with air and sound, weight and atmospheric pressure. They indicate brain, and brain means senses, faculties—in a word, a fully organized form. Atheists, disbelieving in a supreme, intelligent Being—God—should not seek to evade consequences by still using what, to them, is an obsolete term—God—when what they do mean is *nature*—the *nature* of Materialists and Atheists. It is, to say the least, disingenuous. As the duality of Deity is dependent upon the personality of Deity, as an organization, Atheists, denying such personality and organization, are, of course, quite logical in denying such divine duality. Thus the question recurs—can an infinite, omnipresent, omnipotent unorganized God know any thing more than *nature* knows, or than any one of the natural elements knows—as the wind, fire, sea, or an earthquake? Can such a God—unorganized—have any design or scheme of human redemption? Has it any wisdom to ride the whirlwind of human passion, or to direct the storm, through force and violence? By wisdom rightly directed, the Kingdom of Heaven is achieved. The least being in existence is superior to an unorganized God—even as a living dog is superior to a dead lion.

To assume the affirmative that such a God could know, or do any thing, appears as absurd as to say there is a part, when there was no whole, a member where there was no body—an effect, when no cause had

existed to produce it. Beginning on earth with the lowest organism, reasoning logically up to man—from man upward—will it not lead us up, through sphere within sphere, as the soul within the body, to a Supreme, Intelligent, Dual God, as an organized Being, like ourselves, whose image we are? Is not God the brain of the Grand Man; that the Swedish Seer declares the universe to be?

## IS A VIRGIN LIFE CONTRARY TO LAW?

DANIEL FRASER.

No. I.

This inquiry is presented to a numerous class—rich and poor, religious and irreligious, learned and unlearned—all ready to affirm, and quite sure that the life lived by the Shakers is contrary to the great command, “multiply and replenish,” etc. The unanimity displayed by the whole class is remarkable. They see nothing in this question but “the great command,” being quite oblivious to the fact that *functions abused annul the right to exercise them*. And that the last order of a general in command takes the precedence of the former order. Hence, to the woman, “Thy desire being *not* to fulfill the law of use, but to thy husband, thy conceptions shall be multiplied, and he shall rule over thee, and in sorrow shalt thou bring forth.” To the man, “Thorns and thistles shall the earthly man bring forth, and in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.” These words truthfully portray the present condition of humanity.

Evasions of the command, “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread,” has torn empires into pieces, and thrown their civilizations to the winds, and now is the cause of untold human suffering within the British empire alone. More than twenty millions of persons have perished from this cause during the present century. Hence all human governments are unstable.

The evasion of this requirement in our day by a portion of the people of the Southern States shook modern civilization to its center. The settlement of the “great conflict” by the people of the Northern States

has left a tremor in the heart of every European monarch. And Ireland—gaunt and hungry Ireland—has but to shake her lank and toil-worn finger and England's princes tremble in their palaces. Why so? Because in the sweat of the laborer's face they have eaten bread. [There is a growing feeling in the minds of many that man has lost all right to procreate; this feeling is predicated on the facts attendant on procreation and without reference to inspirational revelations. This feeling is fully sustained by the scriptures, not merely by an isolated passage, but by special enactment and concurring texts—"If a woman has borne a man-child she shall be unclean seven days; and for thirty-three days she shall continue in the work of purification. When these days are fulfilled she shall bring a burnt offering, and a sin offering, and atonement will be made for her."]

In summing up the whole matter as regards the primal and subsequent commands in plain English the terms are, "You Adam and Eve have broken the conditions of the primal command—have chosen to replenish the earth in your own way, without reference to the well-being present or prospective of your offspring; hence the earthly man brings forth thistles and thorns in abundance."

Setting aside the consideration of all commands and penalties, I purpose to show from the spiritual constitution of man, and from the awful consequences "of replenishing the earth" irrespective of hygienic and providential laws, that a virgin life is not contrary to either natural or revealed laws, but in harmony with them.

*First.* Man is in possession of and manifests a two-fold life—an animal life, represented by animal emotions; and an inner, a higher life, represented by the emotions of benevolence, mercy, and aspirations Godward.

*Secondly.* Adam and Eve are the type of the animal man; within their province lies the work of procreation; but "the day thou eatest thereof" contrary to law "thou shalt surely die, shame shall cover thee, and in anguish shalt thou bring forth." A correct delineation of the present condition of man-

kind. Additional evidence that law has been, and is violated, is found in the numerous diseases, especially the sexual, which afflict humanity.

*Thirdly.* Christ was the type of the new—the inner man: "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." He was not of the world; His life (not His death) constituted the resurrection. He lived a virgin life, and all in His life are as He was. And wherever two or three are gathered together in that life they constitute a new order of human society—the resurrection or Christ order; having property in common; the strong bearing the burdens of the weak as do the Shakers. "By their works shall they be known."

*Fourthly.* Can the new man marry and be given in marriage and follow Father Adam, the old man, and still be the new man? He cannot; that which is flesh is flesh, and that which is spirit is spirit; that which is animal is animal, and that which is divine is divine. These are contrary the one to the other. To live as Christ lived—be angelic and fulfill the desires of the flesh and of the mind too are an impossibility. Therefore a virgin life is according to law being a condition of the divine—the Christ-life.

*Fifthly.* Was Jesus who took on Himself the nature of His brethren whom He came to redeem a celibate? He was. And did the members of the Pentecostal Church live a virgin-life? They did. As proof thereof they had goods in common and abstained from war. This virgin order of society existed about two hundred years. Had they married there would have been among them a plurality of centers of affection and of interest, consequently a community of goods could not have been maintained, and peace much less.

*Sixthly.* Are the so-called Christians of to-day lineal descendants of the Pentecostal Church? They are not. They are the lineal descendants of the children of this world. They marry, hold private property, take advantage of one another, fight a great deal, and quarrel generally. It was said of them, by one of themselves, "That there is no peace in the church, in the meet-



ing-house, in the school-house, in the sewing circle, nor anywhere else among them."

*Seventhly.* Should the Adamic man cease from committing sin and propagate in accordance with law, would he still be the old man? He would still be the old man, beautiful in his order, but of the earth earthy.

*Eighthly.* Can any infer that it is in accordance with the higher nature or life in man to be heavenly while he is in the body? I can. It is heavenly principles worked out—embodied, which constitutes heaven. Such principles, *when operative*, will bring forth heavenly fruit without reference to locality, whether on earth or in the spirit land. In heaven they do not marry; therefore if heaven is ever found on earth neither will they who are in the kingdom marry; they will live a life of purity, assuming a virgin state as a first condition that they are not of the world—that they have left the kingdom of Adam for an order which is not after the will of the flesh.

*Ninthly.* You have quoted from the scriptures showing that celibacy is a condition of the higher life, but what manifestations have been presented in the history of our race that a virgin life is a condition necessary to the fulfillment of human wants and desires, said wants and desires being in accordance with any law of man's nature? We can only know of law by its manifestations, and that there is a law in our nature responding to a virgin life is evident; it has cropped out in all ages from the earliest historic times; it was manifested in the therapeutæ of Egypt, among the Jews in the Nazarenes, and was developed as a permanent institution in the communities of the Essenes. It may be traced among the Brahmins, and Ascetics of India, and also in China and Japan. The order of the vestal priestesses in the Roman temples lasted about a thousand years; no persons could have been more trusted than these females were. This virgin order gave sanctity and power even to pagan worship, and shows the innate veneration of the human spirit for a life of absolute purity. The monastic orders of Europe speak of its existence from the days of the apostles down to the present hour, a period of nearly two thousand years.

And a class of heretics (so-called) by the Catholic church boldly declared that law to be written in their hearts, and they lived it out in their lives.

*Lastly.* The Shakers of America are living respondents to that law in our nature, a law of the inner life; that absolute purity of body and spirit is a condition necessary to the fulfillment of their wants and desires; and is an essential preliminary to their happiness, namely the manifestation and life of God in their spirits. They believe that all may enter into a heavenly state by cultivating heavenly principles, and that it is their mission to keep an open door for all who live as Jesus lived, and walk as He did walk. Christ was the first born of many brethren; so Ann Lee by entering the resurrection order (as did Jesus) being baptized with the same spirit, she became the first born of many sisters.

The Apostle Paul, the representative of many millions, in speaking of the law above referred to, said: "I feel a law in my members"—animal passions—"warring against the law of my mind" he thanked God and gloried in the cross, as a way of deliverance from the emotions of an animal nature, and responding practically to the law of his mind—the higher—the life of God *hid in every human spirit*; he lived a virgin life.

The natives of Mexico before being invaded by the Spaniards never heard of Paul nor of the virgin life of the Pentecostal-Christians who abstained from war and held goods in common—an order of human society after the law of the spirit of life as it is in Christ Jesus. They never heard of such, yet they from the law written on their hearts responded to the fact of an inner life and to the dignity of the person who lives according to its law. On the invasion of their country they took prisoner a certain person; they discovered that he was a celibate; this to them was a matter of great interest, and they set their wits to work to test how much of a celibate he was. Having exhausted their ingenuity and found him steadfast they then revered and almost worshiped him. They had found a man who for a high purpose restrained the emo-

tions of his animal nature, and the inference was that he was a superior being, and as he was, his life was a response to the law of the higher life, and their admiration was a response to the latent higher life within themselves.

When any person ceases to respond in reverence to the manifestations of self-denial in individuals or in a people they may assure themselves that they are under the power of animal emotional life and have taken more than one step in the downward road of degradation appertaining thereto. The sentiments of the natives of Mexico were identical with those of Paul and the millions he represents. From the four quarters of the globe we have concurring testimony that wherever man has progressed beyond being a mere animal, the law of the higher life has broken forth. First in history is Asia, for thousands of years celibacy has flourished on her soil. In Africa, in the dark sublimity of Egyptian history, there stands forth celibate institutions. Europe, for more than two thousand years, has responded to Asia and Africa in similar manifestations. And, strange to say, before Columbus touched the shores of this western world the people of Mexico and Peru had each their civilizations, and among them also the law of the higher life broke forth in celibate institutions. Having these abundant evidences in view is it not due to the testimony advanced to affirm that a virgin life is founded on a law in our being; the divine element in humanity, which, when operative in human spirits as in Jesus, will bring forth manifestations of God the Father as did the well-beloved Son. He in living the higher life became a son of God — ceased to be a son of Adam — died to his animal emotions which he had in common with men. Hence Jesus Christ stands at the head of the new creation; even as Adam is at the head of the old.

The idea that a virgin life is a contravention of the Creator's plan in creating man is a one-sided thought, and a low estimate of man's ultimate destiny, and is neither sustained by the nature of man nor by the analogy of created things. Jesus in all His more important teachings made use of natu-

ral things to illustrate those of heavenly life. He likened the kingdom of heaven in its various phases to corresponding natural objects, and showed that human beings were as much the subjects of being reaped as the grain they sowed.

[From Seymour Times.]

## SHE RATTLES THE SHAKERS.

BY MRS. HARTER.

If Jesus our exemplar be,  
How few true followers we see;  
None with Him are life partakers  
Except it be the modest Shakers,  
Who live content with no estates,  
And are like Him strict celibates,  
But whether that be more divine,  
Remains unproven we opine.  
Now let us pause and reason here,  
To make the subject still more clear,  
Whether God, the wise Creator,  
Really was an earnest Shaker?  
A Shaker god could have no heart,  
In making man a counterpart,  
And why should he His mind perplex,  
With fashioning the fairer sex?  
If when He bade the man to take her  
He had replied "Nay, I'm a Shaker,"  
The whole creation would have failed  
Had Shakerism then prevailed,  
And where, O where in earth or heavens,  
Would now exist dear Elder Evans?  
He'd not be here to teach reform  
For none of us would e'er been born;  
Nonsense would be our doom,  
And nowhere our eternal home.  
'Twas well for woman and her maker,  
That the first man did not Shake-her,  
But if that be religion true  
'Twas just as needful then as now,  
All nature's demonstrations prove  
That God created all through love,  
And love attracts and correlates  
And through this law God procreates;  
Then why condemn with such persistence  
The law that gives us our existence?  
Nay, do not nature's God demean,  
By calling His just laws unclean.  
Where unperverted nature leads,  
The highest happiness succeeds.

## OPEN LETTER.

Why, my dear sister, Mrs. Harter,  
What's the world can you be "arter?"  
Putting us Shakers so above you  
And all your neighbors who so love you!  
But true it is, the life-partaker  
Must first become an honest Shaker,  
Now let me tell you, my dear madam,  
That when God made the first old Adam,

He had in view the second man  
To introduce the better plan,  
The spiritual to substitute,  
And raise mankind above the brute,  
By leaving off the old profession,  
In this you'll find is true progression;  
But keeping still the counterpart,  
To love in spirit and in heart;  
But having animals outgrown,  
We let the animal alone,  
And live in truth, Christ's higher life —  
Still love the woman, but hate the wife —  
Still love the man — the husband hate,  
Conditions us the higher state.

Below, the counterpart to find,  
We guess and guess, then "go it blind;"  
And then what must we women say?  
"In all things I will thee obey."  
Thus take our counterpart on trust —  
Become a slave to lordly lust —  
To come and go as he may choose —  
To wash his feet or tie his shoes.  
We cannot be among the ris'n,  
But soul and body both are his'n —  
Thus "fixed to one peculiar spot,  
We only propagate and rot."

With all our pledges, vows, and loves,  
We can't rise higher than the doves;  
And all delights we fondly cherish  
How very, very soon they perish!

Your inferential reasoning's good  
For all who want that kind of food —  
A little nest, and a little love-y —  
A little egg and a little dove-y —  
And vine and bud, and breeze and blossom,  
Are on the line of pig and possum —  
Thus live and die and know no better  
Than to be enchained in nature's fetter.

But we in the celestial city  
Look down on such with earnest pity.  
Now, sister Harter, I'm not sportin'  
Of me, I'll tol'rate no such courtin'  
Not while my name is

LIZZIE MORTON.

South Union, Ky., Feb. 23, 1880.

### A VERY PLAIN SHAKER LETTER.

ELMINA D. SLENKER:

*Respected Friend* — Thee says: "I have read thy book;" but thee needs to read it again. Thee not understanding it, compels me, although I regret it, to speak more plainly. Thee should have quoted the parts from which thy opinions were drawn. As it is, I will have to follow thee, as the hunter would, by tracks left in the snow.

The most of thy reasons for preferring indefinitely infidelity to definable Shakerism

are mine for preferring the latter. "It believes in truth wherever found [either natural or spiritual]. It binds no one to follow gods or christ's or man or woman. It does not say, believe this, that or the other, on pain of damnation. It does not scorn any innocent pleasure of body or soul. It is true, liberal, generous, considerate and reasonable." All this the book teaches which thee has "carefully read." But infidelity itself seems to be "creed-bound." It does not allow its adherents to touch the realm spiritual. If they do, they are pronounced fanatics and excluded from the brotherhood. If not so, why is it fighting every thing spiritual the whole world over? It is "not so comprehensive" as Shakerism, which embraces both the natural and spiritual, allowing to each its appropriate place. It leaves all to be free, to believe and do as they may elect, admitting all to be justified before God who act up to their highest light; this also the book teaches. But it cannot change fixed and unalterable law. It cannot cause a particle of matter to occupy two points in space at the same time; but it could do this just as easily as it could cause any one to occupy the generative and regenerative plane at the same time. Can we be censured for not doing impossible things? It seems because we cannot alter this law, which stands philosophically in the fixedness of things, positively unalterable by any power in heaven or earth, we are to be considered fanatical and "creed-bound." The two planes and orders are as distinct and separate as things can be. They are illustrated in the book by lower and upper floors — one plane for generation, the other for regeneration. Now, *generation* means to procreate, as animals do; *regeneration* means to create anew; that is, to take the procreated and make them new creatures — create in them different, nobler and higher impulses and aspirations, and giving the soul the entire ascendancy over and control of the creature, which is not the case on the plane below, where the passions control and run riot, in spite of internal remonstrance. Who, then, can consistently blame us for not admitting that generators occupy as high a plane as do the regenerators?

Shakerism leaves all free to accept the guidance of any person or body of persons, and does not consider them "slaves and fanatics" for the exercise of this freedom. Christ is the Shakers' pattern, but they condemn no one for choosing another, or for choosing blind Nature. Is infidelity more liberal than this? It reaches not above matter, saying, "look to *nature*," and not to *God*, the cause of nature. "We are here without our consent. Let us take all the pleasure and enjoyment that our natures crave." "One world at a time, ladies and gentlemen;" "follow no one, be your own judges, be free; any other course is slavery and fanaticism." "You need not trouble yourselves about 'laying up treasure in heaven, where thieves cannot steal,' till you get there." "'A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush,' enjoy yourselves here; let the future take care of itself, if there is any future; go it while you're young, etc." This is infidelity "defined." But after all this it turns preacher, dons the sacerdotal robe and really gives some good advice. "Be kind, be charitable, be generous; help the poor and needy," etc., etc. This the Shakers have been doing the last hundred years and more. It continues: "Why follow Christ, when the all-powerful voice of nature demands the union of sex?" But be careful, don't indulge too much, keep it on the "honor line." This is good lower-floor advice; but does the priest himself keep it on the honor line? Thee asks: "Who are Christ and Paul, that they should judge for me and thee? Is not nature the better guide?" When thee tells me what nature is, I will then answer the question. Thee says: "Please do not take me for a sensualist in the exaggerated sense, but let me plead for a pure and temperate gratification of all innocent pleasures." I would be most happy, indeed, if I could avoid considering thee a sensualist, even moderately; but Shakers claim for *themselves* the enjoyment of all *pure* and *innocent* pleasures. The difference in us would be in classifying them. The sensualist is one who is devoted to sensual pleasure; thee takes and advocates this position, saying: "I go for the present and its possibilities." The re-

straints thee recommends are only to heighten their enjoyments, not for any higher or spiritual purpose. So, then, thy happiness is merely animal, just such as animals enjoy, the acme of which is the sexual tact; but even this leaves its sting behind. Thee is consequently wholly ignorant of the higher happiness which the unsensual and spiritual-minded enjoy, and which is imperishable. I will freely admit that the union of sex in marriage, which thee speaks of, would be irresistible were it eternal. The nuptial hour—the vows—the priestly ceremony—the thrilling touch—the feast, the music and the dance—the five senses in bewildering and dazzling blaze, form a perfect oriflamme, even with the golden spear through the heart; but from this very hour the blaze diminishes—grows less and less as beauty fades and trials come, till it flickers and disappears, which all the kindling-wood brought to the altar fails to renew; we despairingly stir the coals, then the embers, again and again, producing some warmth, but colder, and colder, and colder they grow, until nothing is left but cinders and ashes. They are dead. But the spiritual and regenerative increases, grows brighter and brighter, and stronger and stronger, time without end. Its life is eternal. Now, which?

The true follower of Christ occupies this higher ground. Am I now understood? Thee asks: "Are not body, soul and mind so closely related that what benefits and pleases one, just as surely affects the other in the same degree?" I answer, by no means; all philosophers agree that spirit and body are distinct and contradictory substances. The body loves sexual lusts, when the spirit is disgusted by them—the body has the pleasure, the spirit the pain. The body may be sick, the spirit well. The body may be burned at the stake, the spirit rejoice. All these are undeniable. If Epicurus meant what his language conveys, I indorse the most of what thee has quoted, but the difference between us is, that while *we* "quiet the passions by *subduing* them, *thee* subdues them by *gratifying* them! So thee should not have quoted Epicurus to sustain thee. But thee further says: "It is not for Shakers

to purify the race by regeneration." How does thee know? If purified at all, it must be done either by generation or regeneration; generation has been trying its hand "fast and loose" for some thousands of years and has proved an utter failure. Suppose we now agree to try regeneration. Should it fail, then our case will be hopeless. Thee adds, "A few reformed drunkards will never make a temperate world," what then? will the moderate drinkers do it, or must we depend on the drunkards themselves? Thee proposes to get all the passions "on the honor line" by moderate usage, but thee will find that there is no cure for drunkenness, occasioned either by the wine of the grape or the wine of fornication, but that of total abstinence; no sensualist can be reformed by a moderate sensuality. Badly as we may hate it, total abstinence and separation from the companionship of such is the only sure remedy. Shakerism does not say, no marriage and no children, but says marriage and children for those who desire them; but in order to escape the stigma of sensualism, they must be as orderly at least, as are the birds of the forest—I mean no offense—please permit me to be plain. Any contact of the sexes, married or unmarried, for mere pleasure is sensuality; who, then, on the lower plane is clear? Shakers contend that marriage is not Christian because its founder was not a generator, but a *regenerator*. The work of the former is below, and performed in the dark; the work of the latter is above and performed in the light. The one is absolutely the works of darkness, the other the works of light. Now please do not call us "creed-bound" because we cannot blend the two into one. This would be as impossible as to blend light and darkness together. To persons coming up and standing and walking in this light, it is impossible for them to do any thing in the dark, for there is no darkness there to do it in. I am wondering now if I am plain enough to be understood. Thee thinks "Shakers must marry or come to nothing;" but they could not marry without coming to nothing! This has often been predicted by moderate drinkers in the last hundred years. Marriage

un-Shakerizes and un-Christianizes all who engage in it. But there is nothing to hinder any from marrying who so desire. There is no element up in the regenerative world of light adapted to it, nothing in harmony with or congenial to it; therefore as the door is open and the stairway clear all such go below of choice. But the regenerators, who can blame them for looking upon such with the eyes of the good apostle, who in his coarse language compares it to the "dog returning to his vomit, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire!" I trust thee will have charity for this plainness of speech, as it seems I cannot be understood without it, as all I have here said is contained in substance in the book which thee has carefully read.

That the Greek philosophers and stoics avoided sexual indulgence to promote vigor and bodily health is true, and a strong argument in its favor. That the idea took visible form in our evolving world and was taught and lived by the Essenes and others and failed, is no evidence of it not being elevating to its devotees. In all history the virgin state has stood high, if not above every other condition. Witness the virgins who watched in turns by night and day the sacred fire on the altar of Vesta; but I need not cite cases. History is replete with them. It is by no means a marvel that Christ took this highest ground, not for the body but the soul. He is the first in our world's history that touched bottom. Leaving the body He comes directly to spirit elevation and says: "Whosoever looketh upon a woman (married or unmarried) to lust after her hath committed adultery in heart." Not one before Him ever touched this ground. If the thought, motive, look and action are the same in the married as in the unmarried, the sensuality and the adultery are the same. So all the efforts on the part of scribblers to place Jesus on a level or a little below "fifteen other crucified saviours," in order to save their lusts are futile, as none who preceded Him ever entered the soul-world as did Jesus. His acceptance of all that was good and true before Him, which His followers now do, goes to His credit instead of His disparagement. Thee says: "A marriage



of one man to one woman seems to be the highest outgrowth of our civilization; this is true of the generative and rudimental plane. The only advantage man, on this plane, can have over the birds, is, he can build a finer nest—that's all. As to his "honor line" being equal to the birds, we dare not affirm. The birds obey the law of nature; but of the species *homo*, where is the pair on the rolling planet that so govern themselves? It is a shame to say it, but they cannot be found. Oh! would I not be thankful to be able to make *one* exception! But none are so temperate, none so self-governed, none? no, not one!

These says: "Offer your young men and maidens a good home, love and marriage, and how many would refuse them?" Of this I cannot say, but I have known fortunes offered and refused. These says: "Knowledge alone has the key to the door that must be opened for the entrance of the goddess of love and purity." By speaking of the physiological only, these seems to recognize no other. There are two distinct kinds of knowledge, *intellectual* and *spiritual*; it is improper to apply physiological knowledge to the *spirit*, this pertains to the *body*. The difference between animals and man is this, the former are *animo-intellectual*, the latter besides the animal are *intellecto-spiritual*. All humans who have no spiritual knowledge are directly on the line of intellectual animals. The infidel who recognizes this has put one foot at least on the round of the spiritual ladder, making further ascension possible.

These thinks I "overdo till the good becomes evil." Good cannot become evil; but these says we are "so bound up by creed." Why, sister, we have no creed, unless it be to vie with each other in doing good. But we must have order in the regenerative as there must in the generative; without which order the celestial heavens would become a bedlam; but we are the freest of the free; as all our bonds are self-imposed, bringing a happiness which the world of generators know nothing of. While below they are fettered and bound by unbreakable chains, imposed on them, for which all their pleasures are not *quid pro quo*. Their very souls

are paralyzed by the deadening stroke of that "triple bolt, the world, flesh and devil," to whom life, vigor and true happiness cannot be restored until they "pant for the higher state of righteousness as the hart for the water brook." Then if they will hold up their beseeching hands they will find angels on the stair-way to help them up, saying, "come up hither;" and when rescued, the tongues of angels cannot express the joy they will feel at their soul's deliverance. This is no fiction, but a reality now attested by a cloud of witnesses, in whom Christ has appeared for the redemption of the world.

H. L. EADS.

## Correspondence.

### NIHILISM—SOCIALISM—SHAKERISM—WHICH?

ED. S. MANIFESTO:

Though absent from you in body, I am often with you—and "the Zion of our God"—in spirit, with you in moral travel, and with you in your earnest efforts to rightly educate and build up a divine humanity, golden with moral beauty, purity and love.

Traveling, as I do, staff in hand, in nearly all lands and climes—Russia, France and America—I cannot well fail of hearing the ringing words *Nihilism, Socialism, Shakerism*—a trinity of unlikes! But what is Nihilism, and what do Russians mean by it? They mean just this: anarchy—destruction without reconstruction. The existence of God, the national government, religion, morality and family laws are to the Nihilists equally odious, and should be utterly destroyed. Because "nothing," as it exists suits them, they are called Nihilists, maintaining "that no one should be bound by laws, or even moral obligations of any kind, but that everybody should be allowed to do exactly as he pleases." But I prefer to let Michael Bakunin, the father of the Nihilistic movement in Europe, speak for himself. These are among his published words:

The world is a lie. The lie must be stamped out.

It is our mission to destroy the *Lie*; and, to effect this, we must begin at the very commencement. Now, the beginning of all those lies which have ground down this poor world in slavery is God. For many hundred years monarchs and priests have inoculated the hearts and minds of mankind with this notion of a God ruling over the world. They have also invented for the people the notion of another world, in which their God is to punish those who have refused to obey their degrading laws here on earth. This God is nothing but the personification of absolute tyranny, and has been invented with a view of either frightening or alluring nine-tenths of the human race into submission to the remaining tenth. \* \* \* Tear out of your hearts the belief in the existence of God; for, as long as an atom of that silly superstition remains in your minds, you will never know what freedom is.

When you have got rid of the belief in this priest-begotten God, and when, moreover, you are convinced that your existence, and that of the surrounding world, is due to the conglomeration of atoms, in accordance with the laws of gravity and attraction, then, and then only, you will have accomplished the first step toward liberty, and you will experience less difficulty in ridding your minds of that second lie which tyranny has invented.

The first lie is *God*. The second lie is *Right*. Might invented the fiction of *Right*.

When you have freed your minds from the fear of a God, and from that childish respect for the fiction of *Right*, then all the remaining chains which bind you, and which are called science, civilization, property, marriage, morality and justice, will snap asunder like threads.

Let your own happiness be your only law. \* \* \* The only revolution which can remedy the ills of the people is that which will tear up every notion of government by its very roots. Having this object in view, the Revolutionary Committee does not propose to subject the people to any directing organization. The future order of things will doubtless originate with the people themselves; but we must leave that to future generations. Our mission is only one of universal, relentless and terror-striking destruction.

If the above doctrines and iconoclastic theories were not begotten of the devil and cradled in the "hells," to use a term of Swedenborg, then devils and hells have no existence. And yet, such principles and such abominable atheistic teachings and political theories not only find a response in the hearts of certain "bumptious Ameri-

cans, but they quite generally crop out at the "Free-thinking" conventions of Materialists.

But is the Socialism of Germany, or the Communism that so often boils and bubbles up in France, preferable in any way to the Nihilism of Russia? Arriving in Paris, on my first tour around the world, I saw the signs of war and Communistic vandalism. Think of it: the Commune shouting "*liberty, fraternity and equality*!" and yet murdering the clergy, firing the city of Paris, and obliterating all evidences of former genius and culture! Possibly the Thiers government was a little oppressive; but did this justify the cry of the mad multitude, "Repeal all law!" — "Fire the churches!" — "Suppress the newspapers!" — "Abolish marriages!" — burn the museums, the libraries and the granaries, and other atrocities of the Commune?

Lest I be thought partisan and partial in arraigning and condemning such phases of Nihilism, Socialism and Communism of the old world as are finding sympathizers in this country, permit me to quote from the late Brooklyn speech of Hon. E. B. Washburne, ex-Minister to France:

When the National Guard became mutinous, unfortunately the government did not act at once and disarm it at whatever cost. It took no resolute steps in that direction; and the spirit of insubordination grew by what it fed on.

The insurrection of the 18th of March, 1871, was the commencement of an orgy of blood and crime, incendiarism, cruelty, ruin and desolation, in the presence of which the world stands aghast. It was on the morning of the 18th of March that the Government had attempted to get possession of the heights of Montmartre and retake the cannon which were in the possession of the National Guard; but that movement utterly failed, for as soon as the National Guard and the Government troops came within sight of each other the Government troops fraternized with the guard and refused to fire upon them. By four o'clock in the afternoon the insurrectionist forces practically controlled the whole city. They had seized two gentlemen, General Clement Thomas and Lecomte, bringing them to a mock court-martial in a little room. They were condemned to death, and immediately shot in an adjoining garden. The Government, seeing the desperate situation, without

any means of defense, immediately left Paris for Versailles, leaving the National Guard in absolute control of the city. \* \*

The men put in power by the Commune had neither honesty, ability, nor executive capacity. There was no weight to be given to the talk of these men that they were fighting for their liberty and municipal rights. It was a fight merely for power and plunder, and to free themselves from the restraints of law. Governed by no principle and having no regard for public right, they bawled for a Republic; but their first act was to murder General Clement Thomas, a republican all his life, driven out of France as such, by Napoleon, at the *coup d'état* of 1851, and only returning to his native land after eighteen years of exile to offer his sword to his country in the hour of her direst need. The reign of the Commune was the force of desperate and wicked men, unlimited, unchecked, unrestrained by any human power.

The most infamous and bloody decrees were issued by the Commune. Fortune, business, public and private, every industry, labor, financial enterprise, were all buried in one common grave, and there was everywhere devastation, desolation and ruin. There was the commission of every outrage, plunder, imprisonment, robbery and every species of persecution. \* \* \*

The governing power during this period was a body calling itself the Commune of Paris, and the members were the most desperate and debauched scoundrels in all the purlieus of the city, but many of them highly educated and cultivated men. They were far more infamous than the same class of men in the worst days of the Roman Empire, whose names have been consigned to eternal infamy by the pen of Tacitus. The orders of this body were instantly and summarily executed by the National Guard, fed, pampered and corrupted, ever ready to carry out its infernal behests, restrained by no fear of the laws of God nor man, and with appetites whetted for plunder and blood, murder, burning, imprisonment and torture. They burned down the Tuileries and the house of Thiers; they burned the Hotel de Ville and the buildings of the Ministry of Finance and Police, and the Legion of Honor, the great palace of the Court of Cassation, and overturned the Column Vendome and at last endeavored to burn the whole city.

I quote thus largely from the records and doings of Nihilism, Socialism and French Communism that the chasm—the varied contrast between those theories of ambitious worldly men—sometimes called “progressives”—and the true genius and logical out-

come of Shakerism, *alias* law, order and spiritual growth, may appear the more wide and appalling.

The primordial principles of Shakerism, if I rightly understand them, are purity, peace and a united inheritance. These principles are permanent and unchangeable, and accordingly the divine church of the ages built upon them—the Apostolic church warmed by the pentecostal fires of spiritual truth, was and necessarily is conservative—that is to say it conserves the good and the true of the past, while it appropriates all that is good and wise and true in the present.

If I correctly read the world this is the drift period—the age of unrest. The old order of things is unsettled, and the noisy and pretentious flock to the front. The solid-pillar men in every age are retiring and quiet. I feel quite sure that since our civil war America has been waxing worse and worse, morally and spiritually. The war-shadow, through reflex action, is still over us, an irreligious, unprincipled “Socialism” is being diffused through the land, indulging in such sentiments as these: “Away with all restraint,” “the passions should have free play,” “let nature take her course,” “be independent,” “be free.” These impulses and teachings are the dogmas of demons.

There is a class of spiritists, and certain ex-Shakers, who are everlastingly dilating upon “liberty” and “more freedom.” These do not seem to distinguish between liberty and license, between law and the disorderly elements of a wild, uncultivated nature. Freedom is a curse to mean, uncultured, impulsive, and unbalanced men. Only angels can safely live in, and breathe the atmosphere of absolute freedom. This persistent shriek for freedom is often ill-timed. There is not a blood-sucking mosquito this side the “dismal swamp” of the South, but that says, “give me freedom.” There’s not a prowling wolf in the forest, but that says, “away with the walls that inclose the sheepfold; give me freedom!” There’s not a brawling inebriate—red-faced and profane, reeling out from the liquor den—that does not say, “give me freedom—I have an inalienable right to drink, or put into my

body what I please." None can fail to see that this is the boast of the brute—the reasoning of the animal rather than the man, or the angel. That truly great English writer, Ruskin, says:

You hear every day great numbers of foolish people speaking about *liberty*, as if it were such an honorable thing; so far from being that, it is, on the whole, and in the broadest sense, dishonorable, and an attribute of the lower creatures. No human being, however great or powerful, was ever so free as a fish. There is always something that he must or must not do; while the fish may do whatever he likes. \* \* \*

Throughout the world, of the two abstract things, liberty and restraint, restraint is always the more honorable. It is true, indeed, that in these and all other matters you never can reason finally from the abstraction, for both liberty and restraint are good when they are nobly chosen, and both are bad when they are basely chosen; but of the two, I repeat, it is restraint which characterizes the higher creature, and betters the lower creature; and, from the ministering of the archangel to the labor of the insect—from the poisoning of the planets to the gravitation of a grain of dust—the power and glory of all creatures, and all matter, consist in their obedience, not in their freedom.

Freedom with its proper limitations is well, and so knowledge is well, but this persistent search for knowledge, rather than for wisdom and moral truth, is to be numbered among the follies of the age. The highest significance of the universe is not the gathering of shells—not the collection of dry facts; nor the study of rigid physical laws; but in studying a living humanity, and seeking the baptismal light of heaven, that sickness may be remedied, poverty abolished, penitentiaries transformed into schools of reform, the moral nature of the masses quickened, and the Christ-spirit of love, and peace, and purity, made the crowning glory of a resurrected humanity.

Shakerism, seen in connection with the incoming cycle, is all rainbowed with promise, and aflame with the light and the love of God. Power does not consist in numbers. The gulf stream, in comparison with the ocean, is small; it sometimes seems as though the ocean would swallow it up; yet there it remains in the ocean, but not of the ocean; there it remains an everlasting river

flowing steadily, bearing the choice treasures of the tropics to colder climes—changing temperatures, modifying the swift-footed winds, spreading the greater blessings of summer warmth—and *all* as a potency and promise of golden fruitage and a waving harvest. So with believers, in the world, but not of the world—so with truth victorious in the end. J. M. PEEBLES.

Hammonton, N. J.

### QUERIES TO A BOSTON MATERIALIST.

*Respected Friend:* I have read your article "*Jesus and the Gospel*." The inquiry is not whether Jesus of Nazareth ever lived, or had an immaculate conception, or that His mission was attended with supernatural manifestations. The inquiry is: Can you and I live a divine life now? If in the nature of things we cannot, would we be able to form a conception of a divine life? or would the ideals associated with the character of Jesus ever exist?

How is it that this Judean peasant cannot be dismissed from our minds? From the days of Voltaire to our own, a period of intense analytic action, continued efforts have been made to stamp Him out; but the more of that there is done, the more He is present. Renan, and a host of others, try to strip Him of every thing supernatural. I object not, yet this same Renan declares that "without Jesus of Nazareth all history is incomprehensible."

You are acquainted with the nature of things, what do they say in this case? First: Man exists. Secondly: *Emotions* are the forces of his being. Thirdly: They are dual—animal emotions represented by the propensities, and divine emotions represented by manifestations of benevolence, mercy and aspirations after, and a growth into these divine attributes. All human manifestations refer themselves to these emotions, and must be either Just, Satanic, or Divine. Each has its own organic law. The Just, is the love of self, and others as self. The Satanic, is the love of self at the expense of others. The Divine, the love of others at the expense of self.

Allow me to repeat the inquiry: Can you

and, I live a divine life now? The answer is in the affirmative; and that it is in accordance with the nature of things to do so whenever we shall so choose. But it is not in the nature of things to be Satanic and Divine at the same time. Therefore, if you or I will be divine, we must come out from under the power of the emotions represented by the propensities — die to them — rise out of the Satanic, through the Just, into the Divine. In short, be unearthed.

We are so covered up with animal, earthly conditions, that the divine in us can hardly breathe. No need of that; when we get ready we can rise up and *shake these conditions off*. Why not now? When you do, you will be the peer of the man of Nazareth; and be able to understand and to judge of Him. Otherwise, you are not His peer, and cannot judge Him.

Truly your friend.

D. FRASER.

### Editorial.

#### IS CHRIST'S EXAMPLE A SAFE RULE OF LIFE?

It is a beautifully growing truth, evidenced by numerous contributions, finding their acceptance by and through the religious press, that *Christianity is a life*, and not merely an assent to this or that particularly formulated creed. It is also a beautiful subject for thought, to consider, that were Jesus living with us to-day, to what denomination could he and would he give his indorsement?

It is a satisfying fact to our minds that Jesus, instead of entering into any organization, bound by creedal limitations, simply lived a superior life to any other life previously lived, and *this life* is the genuine of Christianity. He faulted not the laws of Moses; he did not seek to build a church upon the ruins of Judaism;

but rather urged those who sought eternal life to "keep the commandments;" after which, if any "would be more perfect" than the law taught, then "come and follow me." It would be very well for those who use trenchant tongues and pens in denunciation of other denominations than their own to recollect, that it was many years after the death of Jesus before the formula of a Christian creed was thought of. That Jesus never intimated the necessity of any. That he simply lived *the Christ life*, and lovingly invited "all who were able to come and follow" the same.

It is but fair for us to admit, that there are other religions than that of Jesus Christ which contain many elements of great salvation. The promise of God to Moses to remove all sickness from the midst of his people was fulfilled most astonishingly, by the greatest salvation from physical disorders unto all who kept the Judaical Law; and it is a truth too frequently lost sight of, that before Jesus accepted any as fit companions for his discipleship, that he "healed them" of their physical infirmities. Giving credit to the law for the physical salvations it insures to its faithful adherents, we pass on to the higher salvations and redeeming qualities of genuine Christianity, found by simply following Christ's life. Regardless of the *apostle's creed*, or any and all other theological arrangements — and were they all lost in the labyrinths of oblivion perhaps it were better — we assert Christ's life to be the only genuine Christianity, and one that is so safe to believe in and to follow, that not only all the *salvations* which



Jesus experienced will inevitably succeed, but the *redeeming* features of the Christ will be attained unto thereby; and moreover, that neither the salvations nor redemptions of Christ can ever be obtained, excepting by *living Christianity as Jesus lived it*.

While we claim for the Shaker faith directions therein unto "a higher life" than any predecessor of Jesus ever taught, we do not claim that any nor all are lost who do not fully live it, excepting that the *loss* is by comparison — they are not so fully saved nor elevated unto Christ life. We Shakers simply live as nearly like Jesus as we are able, because we deem it the very best life for us; that it is a safe guide unto heavenly realms of thought, feeling and action, and which no other life differing from that of Jesus can lead us unto.

We know the world at large differ with us, not in the *theoretical admiration* of the beautiful life of Jesus, the Christ; but in accepting the *necessity* of living like Jesus, to obtain what he obtained by so living, thus showing a *practical admiration*. We strive to be content, amid the jeers of a sneering world, that we have chosen the better part, in following Jesus through *all of his self-denials*, and are rewarded, abundantly, with salvations and redemptions which none, nor all worldly wisdom nor pleasures can secure to us, inasmuch as we unselfishly follow the Christ.

So far as we are concerned, we know Christ's life is best for us; and that is our only creed, our only Christianity. It is a safe guide to live by, it is safer to die by, and therefore we present it as best. While striving for the

full attainment of the *higher life* and its complete redemptions like unto Christ's, we would ever be reminded that Christian life is as broad in its Charity, as it is elevated in its love of heavenly things. That it is heaven brought to earth; and that there is in it no possibility of our being too narrow in our views to be well proportioned with our elevations. The full manhood and womanhood of Christ are known by a broad, boundless virgin purity; by an ever-pervading and boundless peace spirit; by a universal love for all mankind, and with desires for their enlightenment that Christ's life is simple and genuine Christianity, and that this is the best and safest religion known; that those who will to live it, are made welcome to all the salvations and redemptions which heaven has ever promised, and that these are possible on the earth. As truly as we know that two and two make four, so truly do we know that a genuine Shaker life, with its practical *Virgin Purity*, its *Peace*, its *Brotherly love*, and *Freedom from worldly taint*, lead to the same happy results which Jesus Christ was resurrected unto, and that for all who "*are able*" to live it, it will prove to be a genuine and most active Christianity, and this is safe, this is best. ☆

#### EDITORIAL NOTES.

##### STARVING IRELAND.

It is a sorrowful fact, but we are forced to the fear that it is too true, that Roman Catholic ecclesiasticism has more to do with the starvation of Ireland than aught else! The inquiries are pertinent: Why are the four

counties in which Roman Catholicism greatly predominates caused to suffer so much more than "all the rest?" Why is it, that Scotland, with a poorer soil, and the same, unjust, rental system active, is and has been exempt from the ravages of starvation, while Ireland's wails have been so frequently heard across the seas? Let Roman Catholicism confess its sins, beginning at the Head, and being reformed, its children will not want nor cry for bread.

#### THE POPE ON MARRIAGE.

In a recently issued encyclical letter of Leo XIII, upon the sanctity of marriage, the following curious passage occurs: \* \* \* "Jesus Christ, the author of the New Testament, transferred marriage from a natural function to a sacrament, and attributed to his church all the legislative and judicial control of it as a binding instrument!"

Now we know, as far as the Pope can tell us, who it was that first made marriage a sacrament in the Christian Church! The records of the New Testament had informed us of the *Virgin Celibacy* of Jesus, and of his demands upon *all* of his disciples, to *forsake* marriage, war, private property and worldly entanglements. We are therein made aware, also, that his immediate disciples did "forsake all to follow him; fathers, mothers, wives, children, houses, lands, and even their lives after the flesh." And in the absence of any information therein as to who changed this Christian arrangement, the flesh-loving "followers" <sup>(2)</sup> of Jesus will render thanks to the Pope. We opine, however, that the

New Testament account of Christ's life and teachings will take precedence of the Pope's, and that all sensible professors of Christianity will simply admit that *marriage*, private property, war and worldly contamination, nowhere find any recognition as elements of Christianity in Jesus nor disciples, but were compromises of Paul's with the "foolish Galatians" and "carnal Corinthians" of his day, and whose successors demand these privileges now as ever, as an assuagement to their worldly, but unchristian lusts. Mark the distinction: "The children of the world marry;" but my children — "the children of the Resurrection" — "I am the Resurrection — do not marry," but live heavenly, like the angels; very much as the Shakers profess to and ought to live.

THE SHAKER MANIFESTO in its turn issues an older, original, Christian, encyclical letter: *Marriage is not of Christ; nor the works of marriage*; but belong to the worldly order, the followers of the first Adam.

#### ACTIVE FRIENDSHIP.

It is with feelings of deep gratitude that we turn often to view, as models of unselfishness, those who continue the staunch friends of THE MANIFESTO; and who give so many reminders of their genuine friendship by generous helps to this office in the circulation of this, our little missionary sheet. Without the possible hope of any pecuniary reward (and while a very few illiberal unShakers are using their little opposition to obtain an unenviable reward), are rendering much missionary help gratuitously, thus "lending

to the Lord," who will not fail to make returns with interest. While we thus render partial thanks to those unselfish enough to confer upon us every little help, we would also inform those receiving specimen copies of THE MANIFESTO, that it is by and through the efforts of some very true and unselfish friends. If any would be glad thus to help us according to their ability, we ask a kindly reading of "SPECIAL NOTICE" on cover, and particularly that part addressed to the "LIBERALLY INCLINED." And to those receiving sample copies, we would respectfully ask of those who are able to send us their subscriptions.

#### THIS NUMBER

Of the MANIFESTO will be found full of grand articles from talented contributors. Could we present such an array of truths invariably, we would willingly lay our pen down. We call especial attention to articles from Elders Avery, Fraser, Eads and Evans. Barring the antique style of pronouns, Elder Eads pays some gentlemanly blows for our side as against his talented Quaker Materialist, whose letter was too lengthy for our space. That "Lizzie Morton" we more than suspect is the same who answered Charlotte Cushman more than forty years ago, and the conclusion of which verily seemed to be always in Charlotte's mind: "And when some flattering knaves around your pathway tread, Just think of what a Shaker girl has said!" We have no apologies to make for the music, it is simply splendid and beautiful.

### The Children's Grotto.

#### BOYS WANTED.

Boys of spirit, boys of will,  
Boys of muscle, brain and power,  
Fit to cope with any thing —  
These are wanted every hour.

Not the weak and whining drones  
That all troubles magnify —  
Not the watchword of "I can't,"  
But the noble one "I'll try."

Do what'er you have to do  
With a true and earnest zeal;  
Bend your sinews to the task;  
"Put your shoulder to the wheel."

Though your duty may be hard,  
Look not on it as on ill;  
If it be an honest task,  
Do it with an honest will.

#### EXPLAINING A TEXT.

A little girl saw hanging in her Sunday-school room this text on an illuminated card: "Let us not be weary in well-doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." She caught the idea of its teaching, and in attempting to repeat it at her home she gave a somewhat free rendering in this form: "Don't you get tired in doing good; for if you don't faint away, by and by you'll get your pay." The truth as she put it is worth bearing in mind.

#### THE CAMEL AND THE MILLER.

Did you ever hear the fable of the camel and the miller? One night a miller was waked up by his camel trying to get his nose into the tent. "It's very cold out here," said the camel. "I only want to put my nose in." The miller made no objection. After a while the camel asked leave to have his neck in, then his fore feet; and so, little by little, it crowded in its whole body. This, as you may well think, was very disagreeable to the miller, and he bitterly complained to the forth-putting beast. "If you don't like it, you may go," answered the camel. "As for me, I've got possession, and I shall stay. You can't get rid of me

now." Do you know what the camel is like? Bad habits; little sins. Guard against the first approaches, the most plausible excuses, only THE NOSE of sin. If you do not, you are in danger. It will surely edge itself slowly in, and you are overpowered before you know it. Be on your guard. Watch.

### TRUST A BOY.

During the session of the late Episcopal convention in Boston, the Bishop of Louisiana, in crossing the Common, met a boy, whose face he fancied, and, calling to him, asked him if he had any thing to do just then, to which he said no. "Are you a good boy?" The little fellow scratched his head and replied: "I am not a very good boy. I cuss a little sometimes." That candid answer inspired the bishop with confidence, and he then said, after giving his name and address: "I want you to go to a certain place and get a bundle for me and bring it to my hotel." There will be a charge of eight dollars. Here is the money to pay it, and half a dollar which you will keep for doing the errand." On his return to the hotel, the bishop's friends laughed at him for his credulity, telling him that he would never see the boy or the bundle or the money again; but in half an hour the young chap returned, bringing the bundle and a receipted bill for eight dollars and a-half, the bishop having made a slight mistake as to the amount that was due. "How did you manage to pay the extra half dollar?" he inquired. "I took the money you gave me for the job. I knew that you would make it all right." And "all right" it was made, and I have no doubt that the confidence that was reposed in that boy, because of his truthfulness, will do him good as long as he lives.—*Bishop Clark.*

### FITLY ANSWERED.

A young city fop, in company with some belles of fashion, was riding into the country a pleasuring, when they saw a rustic looking country lad at work by the roadside. Thinking it a fine opportunity to show his

wit to the damsels, by sporting with the poor boy's ignorance, he accosted him:

"Can you inform me, Mr. Zebedee, how far it is to where I am going, and which is the most direct road?"

Poor Zebby, not the least daunted, but with the most sober and composed face, said:

"If you are going to the gallows, it is but a short distance; if to jail, it stands but a few rods this side; but if only to poverty and disgrace, you are now approaching your journey's end; and as for the most direct road to either, you are now in it, and cannot miss the way." The dandy dropped his head and drove on.

When fine clothes won't treat rusty ones politely, it's a sure sign there's a fool in them.

### Society Record.

We are necessitated to announce the demise of three of our very faithful and prominent members; and as we do so would express the hope that there may be three others as determinedly active to sustain the Cause of Christ, to step in their places, thus keeping the ranks solid, and presenting an attractive array towards any who may be feeling for more Godwardness than than they can find elsewhere.

At Harvard, Mass., Feb. 26, NANCY F. FAIRBANKS, aged 73 years.

At Groveland, N. Y., Feb. 27, ANN LAWSON, aged 72 years.

At North Union, O., Feb. 27, SEWELL G. THAYER, aged 78 years.

#### RECEIVED

From Isaac Auger, \$10.50.

From Melinda Hubbard, \$24.00.

From Herman Muller, a gift of \$5.00.

A king's jester was once asked, "What kind of a place do you think heaven to be?" "A place," said he, "where nought but good is spoken of the neighbor." "And in what," it was again urged, "does its supreme happiness consist?" "In the feeling that no one will slander me there, and that, if I have any faults, it will be so unfashionable to speak of them, that I and all will soon forget them."

## CONSECRATION.

JOSEPH PARKER.

HARVARD, MASS.

1. Here's my heart, to God I give it, Voice and tongue to praise his name;  
 2. I've a conscience thus protected, Worth a throne and di - a - dem;  
 3. I have feet with God they're walking, For with gospel peace they're shod;  
 4. I have ears to hear the story, Men and angels love to tell;

I have life, to Him I live it,— Hands, to Him devote the same.  
 I've a mansion well se - lect - ed In the New Je - ru - sa - lem.  
 Most fa - mil - iar - ly I'm talking, As I take my walk with God.  
 Eyes to see the rising glory, Which shall Zion's triumphs swell.

I've a field, to sow and reap it, And must reap what e'er it grows;  
 Hence I have in this connection, Thus prepared a hap - py home;  
 I have tho't, the greatest pleasure That the U - ni - verse can sing;  
 I have pray'r, to God I make it, While mine eye His throne surveys;

I've a par - n - dise, I'll keep it, For it blos - soms as the rose.  
 Such a home, that my af - fec - tion Does not. will not, can - not roam.  
 There is no ma - ter - ial treasure, Which can such po - ses - sions bring.  
 I've a golden harp, I'll wake it, To a song of endless praise.



## Book Table.

ANOTHER cheap series of popular reading, in the quarto form of the "libraries" so much in vogue, but containing books of a high order of merit, has been started by I. K. Funk & Co., 21 Barclay street, New York—under the title of the *Standard Series*. It begins excellently, the first number (price, twelve cents) containing the full text of the Rev. Spurgeon's John Ploughman's Talk, or Plain Advice to Plain People—and also Carlyle's well-known essay On the Choice of Books. The second and third issues will be Thomas Hughes' The Manliness of Christ (price, ten cents), and six selected essays of Macaulay's (price, fifteen cents). The type is large and the impression neat; and the numbers are issued in a stout paper cover.

The above firm seem determined not to be outdone by the publishers of flashy literature, so far as the cheapness of the better material is concerned. Let the mind "reach after heavenly things," and try the above.

ANOTHER of the new periodicals established at the beginning of the present year is *The Practical American*, a large illustrated monthly paper of thirty-two pages, containing intelligent and serviceable articles on subjects connected with manufacturing and building. It is edited and published by Dr. P. H. Vander Weyde, at 34 Park Row, New York, at a dollar and a half a year.

## KIND WORDS OF US.

That invaluable periodical, Foote's Health Monthly, reminds its thousands of readers that:

"THE SHAKER MANIFESTO is the title of a twenty-four page journal which comes to us regularly as an exchange. It is the official paper of the Shaker societies in the United States, and serves a useful purpose to their members as a medium of thought exchange; but the interest in it is by no means limited to them, for it contains exposition of Shaker doctrines and customs that makes it very readable to all who are interested in various phases of religion and experiments in communistic living. The Shakers are much misunderstood, and often misrepresented by those who attempt to tell

something of them; and any one who desires to become rightly informed concerning their institutions, ideas and customs, cannot find a better way than by sending sixty cents for a year's subscription to *The Shaker Manifesto*, Shakers, N. Y."

And that very big light in dark places—the noble and chaste *New Jerusalem Messenger*, New York, thus compliments and copies us:

"*The Shaker Manifesto* does not believe in the doctrine that the death bed is the supreme moment when the usefulness of a religion may be tested. We append the following sensible words: 'One of the strongest arguments favoring Christianity has been that no one has regretted its practice on the death bed. We present a stronger and stronger; no one having lived it, and enjoyed the purity and excellence of its radical features, ever wished to live or die by any other life doctrine. . . . The death bed is no place to create a criterion, but the active, healthy, good sensed man or woman can tell the truth more effectually.'"

"Oh, he whom Jesus loved has truly spoken!  
The holier worship, which God deigns to bless,  
Restores the lost, and heals the spirit-broken,  
And feeds the widow and the fatherless.

Then, brother man, fold to thy heart thy brother!  
For where love dwells, the peace of God is there;  
To worship rightly is to love each other—  
Each smile a hymn, each kindly deed a prayer.

Follow, with reverent steps, the great example  
Of him whose holy work was DOING GOOD:  
So shall the wide earth seem our Father's temple,  
Each loving life a psalm of gratitude.

Thus shall all shackles fall; the stormy clangor  
Of wild war-music o'er the earth shall cease;  
Love shall tread out the baleful fires of anger,  
And in its ashes plant the tree of peace."

Whittier.

A SWEET temper, a pure heart and clean lips are better evidence of God's grace than any profession of godliness.